



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/529,544	01/20/2006	Anders Umegard	0091-0244PUS1	7897

2292	7590	08/10/2007
BIRCH STEWART KOLASCH & BIRCH		
PO BOX 747		
FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040-0747		

EXAMINER	
HAYES, KRISTEN C	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3609	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
08/10/2007	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

mailroom@bskb.com

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/529,544

Applicant(s)

UMEGARD ET AL.

Examiner

Kristen C. Hayes

Art Unit

3609

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 January 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4 and 8-10 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 5-7 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 29 March 2007 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Information Disclosure Statement

1. The listing of references in the specification is not a proper information disclosure statement. 37 CFR 1.98(b) requires a list of all patents, publications, or other information submitted for consideration by the Office, and MPEP § 609.04(a) states, "the list may not be incorporated into the specification but must be submitted in a separate paper." Therefore, unless the references have been cited by the examiner on form PTO-892, they have not been considered.
2. The information disclosure statement filed 29 March 2005 fails to comply with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97, 1.98 and MPEP § 609 because there is no translation of the foreign reference DE 19947992. It has been placed in the application file, but the information referred to therein has not been considered as to the merits. Applicant is advised that the date of any re-submission of any item of information contained in this information disclosure statement or the submission of any missing element(s) will be the date of submission for purposes of determining compliance with the requirements based on the time of filing the statement, including all certification requirements for statements under 37 CFR 1.97(e). See MPEP § 609.05(a).

Specification

3. The specification is objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. See 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1) and MPEP § 608.01(o). Correction

Art Unit: 3609

of the following is required: "...wherein the correction function selected to be equal to 1 unless the reference value deviate more than a predetermined amount from the sum of all retrieved measured milking performance values." (claim 8, lines 1-3) Although the milk meters being adjusted if the reference value and the sum of the retrieved measured milking performance values differ is disclosed by the specification, the correction function selected to be equal to 1 is not disclosed (page 16, lines 1-3). And also "The method according to claim 8, wherein said predetermined amount is selected to be 5%." (claim 9, lines 1-2). The predetermined amount being 5% is not disclosed by the specification. .

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1-4, and 8-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Van den Berg EP 0713641 in view of Moskvina US Patent 5,161,483.

6. Regarding claim 1, Van den Berg discloses a method for calibrating at least one milk meter (3) in a milking system comprising at least one milking station (100) having at least one milk meter that measures at least one value of a parameter that corresponds to the milking performance of a milking animal (column 1; lines 39-40, 45-46) said milking station is accessible to a herd of milking animals (column 1, lines 1-2),

Art Unit: 3609

characterized in that said method comprises the steps of: determining an internal or external reference value which reflects the amount of milk received from a number of milking animals during a selected time period in a reference unit (column 3, lines 54 – column 4, line 1), retrieving all measured values during the selected time period for each milk meter that by itself contribute to the amount of milk received by said reference unit (6), comparing said reference value with the sum of all retrieved measured values (column 4, lines 1-4). Van den Berg does not teach calculating a correction function for at least one of said milk meters, and using said calculated correction function to adjust the measured value from said at least one milk meter. However, Moskvina teaches calculating a correction function (column 8, lines 60-63) for at least one of said milk meters, and using said calculated correction function to adjust the measured value from said at least one milk meter (column 8, lines 63-67). Calculating the correction function, and using said calculated correction function to adjust the measured value can improve the accuracy of the meter that measures the milking performance of the milking animal, as known in the art. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the method steps of Van den Berg with the teachings of Moskvina in order to adjust the measured value of the milking meter, as known in the art. The method of Van den Berg is then inherently performed.

7. Regarding claim 2, Van den Berg in view of Moskvina discloses a device with the limitations of claim 1. Moskvina teaches a milk meter that has been determined to be in need of a calibration by comparing an expected value of the milking performance with the measured value (column 8, lines 12-16). To achieve optimum performance of a

Art Unit: 3609

milking system, it is critical to know the exact performance of that system. Calibration of the system by comparing measured values to expected values would ensure that the exact output of the system was known. Given the structure, the method is inherently performed, as discussed above. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the device of Van den Berg with the device and inherent method steps of Moskvina to achieve optimum performance of the milking system.

8. Regarding claim 3, Van den Berg in view of Moskvina discloses a device with the limitations of claim 1. Moskvina teaches said reference unit being a receiver (16) that collects the milk in the system after milking of each milking animal, and said step of determining the reference value is performed by measuring the amount of the milk in the receiver, thus said reference value is an internal reference value (column 4, lines 44-55). The receiver collecting the milk in the system after the milking of each animal would provide a central location for the milk to be measured. This way, the milk could be measured at rest instead of as it was flowing through the lines, which would provide a more accurate measure of parameters such as volume, weight, and yield. Given the structure of the combination, the method is inherently performed, as discussed above. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the device of Van den Berg with the receiver and inherent method steps of Moskvina to provide a more accurate measurement of the parameters.

9. Regarding claim 4, Van den Berg in view of Moskvina discloses a device with the limitations of claim 1. Van den Berg further discloses said reference unit being an

Art Unit: 3609

intermediate milk meter (16) which is directly connected to at least one milk meter (5), and said step of determining the reference value is performed by measuring a value of a milking performance parameter of said intermediate milk meter, thus said reference value is an internal reference value, which may be compared to the values measured by each milk meter (column 4, lines 44-55).

10. Regarding claims 8 and 9, Van den Berg in view of Moskvina discloses a device with the limitations of claim 1. The correction function selected to be equal to 1 unless the reference values deviate more than a predetermined amount from the sum of all retrieved measured milking performance values is not taught. When comparing reference values to measured values to achieve a ratio of the two, if the values differ there will be a coefficient greater or less than 1. If the values were the same, meaning there is no difference or error between the two, then the ratio would be 1. The coefficient would then be multiplied by the measured value to correct it to the reference value. If the coefficient were 1, it would still be multiplied by the measured value, which would not change it, signifying that there was no difference between the two. Said predetermined amount selected to be 5% is not taught. The amount that the reference value deviated from the measured value would be the error of the value. It is common for those skilled in the art to allow an acceptable amount of predetermined error in their systems, usually less than 10%. This acceptable amount of error would ensure that the system wasn't constantly correcting itself over small insignificant errors that would probably have little or no effect on the system. Also, given the structure, the method is inherently performed, as discussed above. Therefore, it would have been obvious to

Art Unit: 3609

one skilled in the art that device of Van den Berg in view of Moskvina was able to select a correction function equal to 1 unless the reference values deviate more than a predetermined amount (5%) from the sum of all retrieved measured milking performance values, since the value of the correction function could aid in controlling the error in the system.

11. Regarding claim 10, Van den Berg in view of Moskvina discloses a device with the limitations of claim 1. Moskvina teaches the milking system comprising a control device (31) connected to each milk meter, said internal or external reference value being accessible to said control unit, and said calculations of correction functions being performed in said control unit (column 4, lines 33-35). The control device would be a simple and efficient way to calculate the correction functions, as known in the art. The control device would save time, effort, and reduce the chance of human error being introduced into the calculations. Given the structure, the method is inherently performed, as discussed above. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the device of Van den Berg with the control device and inherent method steps of Moskvina to save time, effort, and reduce the chance of human error being introduced into the calculations.

Allowable Subject Matter

12. Claims 5-7 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Art Unit: 3609

Conclusion

13. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kristen C. Hayes whose telephone number is 571-270-3093. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday, 7:00-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Victor Batson can be reached on 571-272-6987. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

KCH
31 July 2007



Victor Batson
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Art Unit 3609